

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES

OCTOBER 1, 1985  
U.U. 220 3:00pm

CHAIR:

Lloyd H. Lamouria

VICE CHAIR:

Lynne E. Gamble

SECRETARY:

Raymond D. Terry

Members Absent:

Axelroth, Elie

Loe, Nancy

Tandon, Shyama

Blum, Mike

Loftus, Robin

Weatherby, Joe

Bowker, Leslie

McKinstry, John

Wheeler, Marylinda

I. REPORTS:

A. President's Report

1. Program reviews (although they occur at regular intervals) are important and should not become routine. Other reviews (in addition to regular ones) may be in order.
2. The Academic Senate and the faculty, in general, need to play a role in the development and application of standards. We must individually and collectively assure the rigor of our classes and maintain the integrity of the evaluation process. High admissions standards must, likewise be maintained.
3. We must be cognizant of planning which is going on outside the University. For example, the Asilomar Conference will explore the mission of the CSU system.
4. Referring to the Commission to Review the Master Plan of Higher Education, President Baker noted two primary issues in the CSU System:
  - a. The development of a statement of the role of definition of research.  
There must be support (both locally and statewide) for research without which the University may promote mediocrity and/or decline in stature. We must support professional development in a better manner than it has been supported in the last 25 years.
  - b. The need for stand-alone doctorates within the CSU System.

5. President Baker indicated the need for long-range planning to be based upon and developed in accord with the school's statement of goals. The first step in preparing for the next decade will begin with the Convocation of Faculty (October 10).
6. The President noted that construction on the new Agriculture Building will begin in Winter 1986. After that, plans are being made for a single faculty office complex to provide for half of the remaining need for office space. We will thus reach the limit to expansion based on our capacity of 14,000 students. We must decide whether to go beyond this upper bound.

B. Statewide Senators' Reports

1. The Chair announced Barton Olsen's absence and called upon Reg Gooden (Political Science) and Tim Kersten (Economics) for a report.
2. Tim Kersten directed the Senate's attention to the Resolution and Report on Collegiality. He indicated some other topics before the Statewide Academic Senate. It was pointed out that the stand-alone doctorates mentioned in A. 4. b. above included the Ed.D. Doctor of Engineering and Doctor of Nursing, in addition to Ph.D.'s.
3. The Chair thanked Reg and Tim for their reports and informed the Senate that they were also influential members of various state-wide (sub) committees of the Statewide Academic Senate.

C. Report by the Chair on the Summer Activities of the Executive Committee

1. Appointed Ray Terry (Mathematics) Acting Secretary;
2. Made appointments to 13 of the 14 Academic Senate Standing Committees;
3. Recommended appointments to the 19 campus-wide Standing Committees;
4. Finalized the Academic Senate Schedule of Meetings;

5. Directed the Fairness Board to work through the Constitution & ByLaws Committee in preparing a revised draft of the Fairness Board Description and Procedures Document.
6. Recommended to the Environmental Health & Safety Subcommittee of the Public Health & Safety Committee that Cal Poly withdraw its application for a hazardous waste storage permit pending a response to seven specific questions;
7. Requested from (and was denied by) the Administration assigned time for six of the Senate's Standing Committees;
8. Sponsored the Fall Conference Reception for Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes;
9. Protested the Administration's failure to consult the Senate and failure to conduct a national search in attempting to divide the advertised position of Associate Provost for Information Systems into two positions and fill these from within the University without advertising.  
(The matter was resolved satisfactorily by the appointment of a faculty-administration Task Force to determine the campus' total needs and to prepare position description(s).)

## II. BUSINESS ITEMS:

### A. Election of the 1985 -1986 Secretary

Ray Terry was nominated to be Secretary of the Academic Senate. When there were no further nominations, it was moved that he be elected by acclamation.

### B. Constitution and ByLaws - John Rogalla

1. This item, which was carried over from the May 30, Academic Senate meeting, would establish the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) as a Standing Senate Committee.
2. John Rogalla called attention to the main points of his written report (distributed with the agenda).

3. Both he and Ray Terry (Chair of the UPLC) agreed that the recommendations made in page 3 of the report were independent of the more controversial issues of the criteria and procedures to be used by the committee which were discussed in the first two pages of the report.
4. The Report was accepted unanimously by the Senate.

C. UPLC Report - Ray Terry

1. Background information was provided concerning the criteria and procedures used by the UPLC in 1983-1984 and in 1984-1985.
2. The six-page report was summarized. Attention was called to Section D, E, and F concerning the UPLC's criteria and procedures.
3. It was pointed out that there was a division within the Committee which reflected the campus-wide division as to whether the quality of proposals in different schools should be compared, whether proposals for research should be given preference to proposals for study, whether each school should have a quota of funded proposals.
4. Tim Barnes (History) was invited to speak. He indicated that it was the UPLC's intention that the two criteria provided in Section D of the UPLC Report were meant to be weighted equally.

Professor Marshal Wright (Chemistry) inquired if an average were required to accomplish the equal weighting.

5. Susan Currier (English) suggested legitimate purposes for professional leaves that would be neither research nor study proposals.
6. Alan Cooper (Biology) denounced the report vehemently and indicated that the Biological Science Department was almost unanimously opposed to it.
7. In response to an inquiry as to whether we even needed a committee like the UPLC, it was established once again that the existence of such a committee is mandated by the MOU.

8. Reg Gooden posed two alternatives: Either the UPLC can be a rubber-stamp for school decisions; or it can engage in serious scrutiny, embrace standards, and keep other schools/colleagues honest.

He expressed his hope that the UPLC will become a serious committee with the proper measure of oversight responsibility.

It was noted that self-restraint is always present since each member of the committee represents a different interest group.

9. Alan Cooper ((Bio.Sci.)) noted that the MPPP awards were distributed to the schools in accord with a formula.

Charles Andrews (Accounting) indicated that while the distribution of MPPP awards is provided by the MOU, the Contract remains silent on the allocation of professional leaves.

10. Charles Andrews (Acct) moved that the UPLC document go to a second reading. A two-thirds vote was required. The motion failed.

11. Susan Currier (English) drew attention to two amendments that had been distributed at the meeting.

Upon questioning by Larry Gay (IT) it was determined that the amendments had been authored by Ray Terry for the purpose of channeling the efforts of the opposition to the UPLC document along constructive paths.

12. Whether the UPLC was required to develop a single prioritized list of professional leave applications was questioned.

13. Whether it was appropriate to include deadlines for Senate action in the amendments to the UPLC report was questioned.

John Rogalla (Ag Mgmt) noted that the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications (UPLC Report, p.6) provided for an annual review by the Senate (at the UPLC's request) of UPLC criteria and procedures.

14. Mike Botwin (Arch Engr) suggested removing the deadlines from the amendments and then approving the amendments.

15. Tim Kersten (Economics) remarked that something must be done to prevent an outstanding proposal from one school not being funded, while a mediocre proposal from another school is funded. Such a situation can occur with an allocation to schools by quota.
16. Crissa Hewitt (Art) indicated that a professional leave should be of benefit to the University and that there are many ways to benefit the University.  
She expressed the fear that UPLC might be the first step in the direction of a University-wide Tenure Committee or a University-wide Promotion Committee.
17. Reg Gooden (Pol Sci) said that it was important for us to give the Trustees the impression that we carefully scrutinize professional leave applications at all levels (both school and university). If they feel we simply dole out paid leaves on the basis of a quota, the funding of professional leaves may become even more difficult.
18. The Chair expressed his hope that the Senate would resolve the matter at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.